

EXHIBIT A



JAN 27 2014

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: [Signature] Deputy Clerk

Christopher B. Dolan (SBN 165358)

Emile A. Davis (SBN 208394)

THE DOLAN LAW FIRM

1438 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94102

Telephone: (415) 421-2800

Facsimile: (415) 421-2830

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ANG JIANG LIU, HUAN HUA KUANG, ANTHONY LIU

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

ANG JIANG LIU, AS AN INDIVIDUAL
AND AS GUARDIAN AD LITEM FOR
ANTHONY LIU, AND SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE
OF SOFIA LIU, HUAN HUA KUANG,
ANTHONY LIU

Plaintiffs,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER
LLC, RASIER-CA LLC, SYED
MUZZAFAR, and DOES 1-30,

Defendants.

Case No. **C GC - 14 - 536979**

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

- 1. WRONGFUL DEATH**
- 2. NEGLIGENCE – MOTOR VEHICLE**
- 3. NEGLIGENT INFLECTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**
- 4. NEGLIGENCE**
- 5. NEGLIGENCE PER SE**
- 6. STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY**
- 7. NEGLIGENT HIRING RETENTION
AND SUPERVISION**
- 8. LOSS OF CONSORTIUM**
- 9. WRONGFUL DEATH SURVIVAL
ACTION**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff ANG JIANG LIU is an adult male. He is the husband of Plaintiff HUAN KUANG and father of Plaintiff ANTHONY LIU and decedent SOFIA LIU.

2. Plaintiff HUAN KUANG is an adult female. She is the wife of Plaintiff ANG JIANG LIU, and Mother of Plaintiff ANTHONY LIU and decedent SOFIA LIU.

3. Plaintiff ANTHONY LIU is a minor. He is the brother of the decedent SOFIA LIU.

4. Defendant UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC (hereinafter "UBER") is a Delaware Corporation and or Does 1-10 are corporations and/or business entities of a form unknown, which run a Transportation Network Company (TNC) known as UBER which provide a number of transportation options and vehicles for users of their service, including a low cost option called Uber X, through an online-enabled application (hereinafter "APP"). UBER has its principal place of business in and conducts business in San Francisco, California.

5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on the basis of said information and belief allege that RASIER LLC is a Delaware Limited Liability Company which is a wholly owned subsidiary of UBER and the parent company of RASIER-CA LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company. RASIER LLC & RASIER-CA LLC have their principal place of business in and conducts business in San Francisco, California.

6. UBER and DOES 1-10, use RASIER LLC and/or RASIER-CA LLC and/or Does 21-30 to operate a TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANY (TNC) known as Uber X, a division of UBER and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30's commercial enterprise.

7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of information and belief allege that RASIER-CA LLC has been assigned Carrier ID PSG0032512 by the PUC and that UBER, RASIER LLC and/or RASIER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 use Carrier ID PSG0032512 to operate its TNC, Uber X in California.

8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of information and belief allege that RASIER-CA LLC is the insurance certificate holder for the insurance that UBER is required to carry as a TNC by the PUC, which it uses for its Uber X operations.

1 9. Defendant SYED MUZZAFAR is an adult male. On December 31, 2013, he was the
2 driver of the vehicle which killed SOPHIA LIU, and injured HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY
3 LIU.

4 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and the basis of said information and belief, allege,
5 that on December 31, 2013, at the time of this collision, Defendant MUZZAFAR was a
6 driver/transportation provider who was operating his vehicle utilizing the UBER APP and as
7 such was an agent and/or employee and/or partner of UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or
8 RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and/or Does 21-30.

9 11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and the basis of said information and belief, allege,
10 at all times material to this complaint, UBER and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC
11 and/or Does 1-10 and/or Does 21-30 were the employer of Defendant MUZZAFAR, and/or his
12 partner and/or an agency relationship existed between them.

13 12. Does 11-20 are believed to be the owners of the vehicle driven by MUZZAFAR at the
14 time of the collision.

15 13. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the names of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through
16 30, inclusive, and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will
17 amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiffs are
18 informed and believe and thereon allege that each of said fictitiously named Defendants is
19 responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiffs' injuries
20 herein alleged were caused by the aforementioned Defendants.

21 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of said information and belief
22 allege, that at all times herein material to this matters alleged in this Complaint, each of the
23 Defendants was the agent and/or employee and/or partner of each of the remaining Defendants
24 and, in doing the things herein alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency
25 and/or employment, and/or aided and/or abetted the others and/or ratified the acts of the others
26 so as to make them liable for the Plaintiffs' damages.

27 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of said information and belief
28 allege, that there is a unity of interest and operation between UBER, RAISER LLC, RAISER-

1 CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 such that their separate and independent classification is but
2 a fiction and that each is the alter-ego of the other.

3 16. Defendants are liable for the acts of each other through principals of *respondeat*
4 *superior*, agency, ostensible agency, partnership, alter-ego and other forms of vicarious liability.

5 6 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

7
8 17. Venue in this court is appropriate as the injuries to the Plaintiffs occurred in San
9 Francisco County.

10 18. Jurisdiction is proper in this case in that the amount in controversy is in excess of the
11 statutory requirements of this court.

12 13 FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

14
15 19. On December 31, 2013, at just before 8:00pm, HUAN KUANG was walking home in
16 San Francisco with her two children, ANTHONY LIU, who was 5 years old, and SOFIA LIU,
17 who was 6 years old.

18 20. They approached the intersection of Polk Street and Ellis Street. When the light was
19 green for them to walk, they began to cross Polk Street within the crosswalk.

20 21. As they were in the cross-walk, with the signal green for them to walk, a vehicle driven
21 by Defendant SYED MUZZAFAR turned right from Ellis Street and collided with HUAN
22 KUANG, ANTHONY LIU and SOFIA LIU.

23 22. The collision caused the wrongful death of SOFIA LIU, and caused serious and
24 significant physical and mental injuries to the other Plaintiffs in this action.

25 23. UBER, RAISER LLC, RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 and their Uber X
26 service have been classified by the California Public Utilities Commission (hereinafter "PUC")
27 as a TNC.
28

1 24. UBER, RAISER LLC, RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30, through its
 2 services, including Uber X, provides prearranged transportation services for compensation using
 3 its APP or platform to connect persons wanting to procure transportation (hereinafter
 4 "USERS"), with those who, utilizing their own personal vehicles, want to provide transportation
 5 ion exchange for compensation (hereinafter "DRIVERS").

6 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of said information and belief
 7 allege, that MUZZAFAR was logged on to the UBER APP at the time that the collision
 8 occurred and was appearing as a UBER and/or Uber X DRIVER available for providing
 9 transportation services to USERS and/or was viewing, monitoring and/or interacting with his
 10 wireless communications device/smartphone/GPS at or near the time of the collision.

11 26. Before USERS can utilize the APP, USERS must become "partners" of UBER, UBER,
 12 RAISER LLC, RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 by logging into UBER's APP or
 13 web based portal and provide information about themselves to UBER including their name, e-
 14 mail, credit card number, mobile telephone number, etc. Only registered USERS can use
 15 UBER's APP to prearrange transportation service.

16 27. Before DRIVERS can participate in UBER'S, RASIER LLC'S, RAISER-CA LLC'S
 17 and Does 1-10 and 21-30's prearranged transportation service, including but not limited to Uber
 18 X, they must apply to be a DRIVER by logging into UBER's APP or web based portal and
 19 providing information including but not limited to their name, phone number, address, e-mail,
 20 banking information, vehicle registration, insurance, vehicle description, and have their vehicle
 21 inspected. UBER, RASIER LLC and RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 are required
 22 to conduct a background investigation of their DRIVERS including but not limited to their
 23 driving and criminal history (and thereafter conduct periodic reviews of their driving history).
 24 UBER, RASIER LLC and RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 then evaluate the driver
 25 and only permit those drivers it finds suitable to become registered DRIVERS on its APP.
 26 UBER, RASIER LLC and RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 reserve the right to
 27 remove or delete DRIVERS from their system at their discretion. Therefore UBER, RASIER
 28

1 LLC and RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 are entirely in control of who can use
2 their system as either a DRIVER or USER.

3 28. Only after USERS and DRIVERS have provided the information required by UBER,
4 RASIER LLC and RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30 can they participate in the pre-
5 arranged transportation service.

6 29. USERS seeking transportation services provided by UBER, RASIER LLC and
7 RAISER-CA LLC and Does 1-10 and 21-30, such as Uber x and its DRIVERS, log on to the
8 APP which is under the URL, www.uber.com, and arrive at a main screen that says UBER.
9 From that main screen they can navigate among different types of transportation services
10 (generally distinguished by type of vehicle) including Uber X which is touted as "the low cost
11 UBER."

12 30. USERS who chose Uber X are shown a GPS looking screen which displays vehicles
13 available to provide transportation services in their area. After requesting a DRIVER, the APP
14 alerts nearby DRIVERS who must timely indicate their acceptance of the USER'S
15 transportation request by manually interfacing with the APP. Once the DRIVER accepts the
16 USER's request that drivers name, photo, vehicle description, user rating, and time from pickup
17 are displayed to the USER.

18 31. DRIVERS, in order to be available to provide USERS transportation services in
19 exchange for compensation, must log on to the UBER and/or Uber X APP and indicate their
20 availability. Their location and information is then visible to USERS and DRIVERS can access
21 a screen on their electronic communication device/smart phone/GPS called a "God View"
22 which shows them a map of where others using the system are located.

23 32. The PUC has found that, "clearly, each TNC is receiving either an economic benefit or
24 a business benefit. At a minimum, they are receiving increased patronage with the growth of
25 their businesses."

26 33. UBER and Uber X's brand and value to USERS, and potential USERS, is enhanced by
27 having a significant number of DRIVERS registered, visible to the USERS on the UBER APP,
28 and available in close proximity to USERS so as to provide transportation services. Indeed

1 UBER states on its website "When you request a driver we'll find a driver and let track their
 2 location on the map. Your driver's name and car details appear in the app and you can message
 3 or call if you need to". "UBER'S, and/or RASIER LLC's and/or RAISER-CA LLC's and/or
 4 Does 1-10 and 21-30's competitive advantage in the transportation industry is fostered by
 5 having an APP that shows both DRIVERS and USERS where the other is, providing
 6 information and reviews about the DRIVER and USER, permitting communication by text and
 7 phone between DRIVER and USER and by demonstrating the large number of available
 8 DRIVERS which are logged on to the UBER APP.

9 34. UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30
 10 derive an economic benefit from not only having USERS transported by DRIVERS collecting a
 11 portion of the charge for transportation, it derives an economic benefit, and competitive
 12 advantage, by displaying the location of available vehicles near the USER's location. USERS
 13 seeing the ready supply of UBER and/or Uber X vehicles have greater consumer confidence
 14 that they will be able to obtain one-to-one prearranged transportation services rapidly and are
 15 therefore more likely to be repeat customers. In this way UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or
 16 RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 enhance their business by attracting a larger
 17 number of USERS to their services and, therefore, increase their market share of the
 18 transportation industry and commerce in the business sector in which they are providing service.
 19 Therefore, regardless of whether a DRIVER actually has a USER in their car, is on the way to a
 20 USER who has engaged the DRIVER through the APP, or simply is logged on to the APP as an
 21 available DRIVER, UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
 22 and 21-30 derives an economic benefit from having DRIVERS registered on the service.

23 35. The nature of the APP and its interface is both visual and tactile. Therefore, DRIVERS
 24 must monitor their wireless communications device/smartphone/GPS so as to be aware of the
 25 location of other UBER and/or Uber X vehicles so they can position themselves near areas of
 26 high USER demand. The APP provides for texting and phone calling and instant messaging
 27 between the DRIVER and the USER.
 28

1 36. UBER and/or Uber X DRIVERS must respond quickly to a USER request for service by
 2 physically interfacing with the APP thereby leading to distraction while a DRIVER monitors
 3 and/or uses the APP on their wireless communications device/smartphone/GPS. Defendants
 4 UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 knew, or
 5 should have known use of the APP by DRIVERS, including but not limited to MUZZARAF, in
 6 the manner intended and actually required by UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA
 7 LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, would be in violation of California Vehicle Code 23123
 8 which, in subsection (a) states "A person shall not drive a motor vehicle while using a wireless
 9 telephone unless that telephone is specifically designed and configured to allow hands-free
 10 listening and talking, and is used in that manner while driving."

11 37. Defendant UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
 12 and 21-30 knew, or should have known that use of the APP by DRIVERS, including but not
 13 limited to MUZZARAF, in the manner intended and actually required by UBER, and/or
 14 RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, and/or RASIER LLC
 15 and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, would be in violation of California
 16 Vehicle Code Section 23123.5 which, states "(a) A person shall not drive a motor vehicle while
 17 using an electronic wireless communications device to write, send, or read a text-based
 18 communication, unless the electronic wireless communications device is specifically designed
 19 and configured to allow voice operated and hands-free operation to dictate, send, or listen to a
 20 text-based communication, and it is used in that manner while driving. (b) As used in this
 21 section "write, send, or read a text-based communication" means using an electronic wireless
 22 communications device to manually communicate with any person using a text-based
 23 communication, including, but not limited to, communications referred to as a text message,
 24 instant message, or electronic mail."

25 38. Pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 26708 any portable Global Positioning
 26 System (GPS), may only be mounted in a seven-inch square in the lower corner of the
 27 windshield farthest removed from the driver or in a five-inch square in the lower corner of the
 28 windshield nearest to the driver and outside of an airbag deployment zone," if the system is

1 used only for door-to-door navigation while the motor vehicle is being operated." The
 2 UBER APP is, by its nature, a GPS.

3 39. Use by UBER and Uber X DRIVERS of a GPS while engaged in the business activity
 4 of being a UBER or Uber X DRIVER is not door-to-door navigation and, therefore, violates
 5 California Vehicle Code Section 26708.

6 40. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of said information and belief
 7 allege that the status of MUZZARAF as an UBER and/or Uber X DRIVER, including but not
 8 limited to the use and/or monitoring of the APP and its interface, was a proximate cause of this
 9 collision including but not limited to its causing MUZZARAF to be distracted while driving.

10 41. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of said information and belief
 11 alleges that the design of the UBER APP and DRIVER interface, requires drivers to use the
 12 APP in such a manner as to violate the law, including but not limited to CA. Vehicle Code
 13 Sections 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708, the legislative history of which is discussed, in part, in
 14 *People v. Spriggs*, (2013) 215 CalApp.4th Supp.1, thereby causing distraction to DRIVERS,
 15 including MOZZARAF and, further, that MUZZARAF's distraction was a substantial factor in
 16 causing the subject accident and resultant harm.

17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Wrongful Death**

19 **By Plaintiffs ANG JIAN LIU and HUAN KUANG**
 20 **Against All Defendants**

21 42. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of
 22 Paragraphs 1 through 41.

23 43. Defendants and each of them owed Plaintiffs a duty of reasonable/due care as well as
 24 statutory duties established in California Vehicle Codes, 21950, 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708.

25 44. Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
 26 and 21-30 were negligent in their development, implementation, and use of the APP in the
 27 provision of prearranged transportation services in such a manner so as to lead to DRIVERS,
 28 including MUZZARAF, to be distracted and/or inattentive, while driving.

1 45. Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
2 and 21-30 are, as more fully set forth below, liable in strict product liability, for the defective
3 APP and/or user interface.

4 46. Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
5 and 21-30, and each of them, through their wrongful acts, as set forth above, breached their
6 duties of care and said breach was the proximate cause of the death of SOFIA LIU.

7 47. As a proximate result the negligence of Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or
8 RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, and each of them, Plaintiffs ANG LIU and
9 HUAN KUANG have suffered great loss and harm, including but not limited to funeral and
10 burial expenses, loss of love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection,
11 society and moral support in an amount to be established at the time of trial.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Negligence –Motor Vehicle**

14 **By Plaintiffs HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU**

15 **Against All Defendants**

16 48. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of
17 Paragraphs 1 through 47.

18 49. Defendants and each of them owed Plaintiffs a duty of reasonable/due care as well as
19 statutory duties established in California Vehicle Codes, 21950, 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708.

20 50. Defendant MUZZARAF, on December 31, 2013, while operating his vehicle in the
21 scope and course of his employment/agency/partnership with UBER, and/or RASIER LLC
22 and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, was negligent and did breach one or
23 more of those duties and said breach was the proximate cause of personal injuries to Plaintiffs
24 HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU.

25 51. Defendants 11-20 were negligent in their entrustment of the vehicle being driven by
26 MUZZARAF on December 31, 2013.

27 52. As a proximate result the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have
28 suffered significant general and special damages in amounts to be determined at trial.

1 53. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression
 2 and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but
 3 not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant
 4 to California Civil Code Section 3294.

5
 6 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
 7 **By Plaintiffs HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU**
Against All Defendants

8 54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of
 9 Paragraphs 1-54.

10 55. Plaintiffs HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU, mother and brother to decedent
 11 SOFIA LIU, were with SOPHIA and, therefore, in the legally recognized "zone of danger"
 12 created by the Defendants, and each of them, when they wrongfully caused the death of
 13 decedent SOFIA LIU and the physical injuries to HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU.

14 56. Plaintiffs HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU were aware of, and did witness the
 15 injuries sustained by each other and SOFIA LIU so as to suffer the negligent infliction of
 16 emotional distress as recognized in the case of *Dillon v Legg*, (1968) 68 Cal.2nd 728.

17 57. As a proximate result the negligence of Defendants and each of them, Plaintiffs HUAN
 18 KUANG and ANTHONY LIU have suffered significant general and special damages in
 19 amounts to be determined at trial.

20 58. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression
 21 and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but
 22 not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant
 23 to California Civil Code Section 3294.

24
 25 \\\

26
 27 \\\

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**Negligence****By all Plaintiffs****Against Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC
and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30**

59. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of Paragraphs 1-58.

60. Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 and DOES 1-10 were negligent in their development, implementation, and use of the APP in the provision of prearranged transportation services in such a manner so as to lead to DRIVERS, including MUZZARAF, to be distracted and/or inattentive, while driving.

61. Defendants UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 required its DRIVERS to use a smartphone APP and/or GPS that causes, and did cause, driver distraction and inattention to the roadway, such that it was the proximate cause of the subject accident and resulting personal injuries to Plaintiffs HUAN KUANG and ANTHONY LIU.

62. As a proximate result the negligence of Defendant UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30, and each of them, Plaintiffs have suffered significant special and general damages in amounts to be determined at trial.

63. As a proximate result the negligence of Defendants and each of them, Plaintiffs ANG JIANG LIU and HUAN KUANG suffered wrongful death damages.

64. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294:

\\

\\

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Negligence Per Se
By Plaintiffs
Against ALL DEFENDANTS

65. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of Paragraphs 1-64.

66. California Vehicle Codes, 21950, 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708 were laws implemented by the State of California to protect individuals from injury or death due to inattentive or distracted drivers. Plaintiffs and each of them were of the class of persons intended to be protected by these laws.

67. Defendants and each of them therefore owed Plaintiffs a duty to conduct their affairs in accordance with California Vehicle Codes, 21950, 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708.

68. Defendants and each of them breached one or more of the duties established by California Vehicle Codes, 21950, 23123, 23123.5 and/or 26708. Such conduct constitutes *negligence per se*.

69. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs, and each of them, suffered significant general and special damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

70. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Strict Products Liability- Bystander Theory
By All Plaintiffs
Against UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or
RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30

71. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of Paragraphs 1-70.

72. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon said information and belief allege, that Defendant UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and

1 21-30 designed and/or distributed the APP and/or GPS interface/system that UBER DRIVERS,
 2 including MUZZARAF, were required to use and furthermore trained or failed to adequately
 3 train them on how to use the APP and interface.

4 73. In doing so UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10
 5 and 21-30 did place the APP and GPS system into use and on the market.

6 74. UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30
 7 had, or should have had, knowledge that the APP and/or GPS interface would be used without
 8 inspection for defects and would be used in such a way as to violate one or more provisions of
 9 the California Vehicle Code and/or to create a significant risk of the type of harm suffered by
 10 the Plaintiffs in this action.

11 75. The defects in the APP and/or GPS interface were the direct and proximate cause of
 12 harm to all of the Plaintiffs including the physical and emotional injuries suffered by HUAN
 13 KUANG and ANTHONY LIU and the wrongful death of SOPHIA LIU and the injuries that
 14 flow therefrom to all Plaintiffs. Strict liability extends not only in favor of the users and
 15 consumers, but also in favor of bystanders such as pedestrians. (*Elmore v. American Motors*
 16 *Corp.*, (1969) 70 Cal.2d 578, 585-587; *Baker v. Chrysler Corp.*, (1976) 55 Cal.App.3d 710,
 17 715, *Preissman v. Ford Motor Co.*, (1969) 1 Cal.App.3d 841, 855.)

18 76. The APP and/or GPS interface was defective.

19 77. As a proximate result of the product defect, Plaintiffs, and each of them, suffered
 20 significant general and special damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

21 78. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression
 22 and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but
 23 not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant
 24 to California Civil Code Section 3294.

25 \ \ \

26
 27 \ \ \

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Negligent Hiring, Retention, Training and Supervision
By all Plaintiffs
Against UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or
RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30

79. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein Paragraphs 1-78.

80. UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 owed the general public a duty of reasonable care in the hiring, training and supervision of its DRIVERS.

81. UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 did breach that duty of care in the hiring, retention, training and/or supervision of Defendant MUZZARAF who was unfit to be a provider of transportation, and who was not adequately trained or supervised in his driving and/or use of the APP and the dangers inherent therein. UBER, and/or RASIER LLC and/or RAISER-CA LLC and/or Does 1-10 and 21-30 knew or should have known that Defendant MUZZARAF would be using the APP in a manner which would distract him and lead to a risk of the very type of danger and harm that occurred on December 31, 2013.

82. The breach of that duty was the proximate cause of harm to the Plaintiffs causing them to suffer significant special and general damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

83. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, paragraphs 1-48 as if fully set forth herein.

\\

\\

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**Loss of Consortium
By Plaintiff ANG JIAN LIU
Against all Defendants**

84. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the contents of Paragraphs 1-83.

85. Plaintiff ANG JIAN LIU because of the wrongful acts of Defendants, and each of them, suffered a loss of consortium with his wife HUAN KUANG.

86. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff ANG JIAN LIU suffered significant special and general damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

87. The conduct of the Defendants and each of them was engaged in with fraud, oppression and/or malice, and was in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs herein so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294.

**NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Wrongful Death - Survival Action
By ANG LIU AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST
Against all Defendants**

88. Plaintiff ANG LIU, as Successor in Interest, on behalf of the Estate of Sophia Liu, hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-87 as if fully set forth herein.

89. Prior to her death, Sofia Liu suffered losses and damages including but not limited to significant medical expense.

90. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.30 Plaintiff ANG LIU, as Successor in Interest on behalf of the Estate of Sophia Liu, seeks recovery of those damages provided for pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.34 including punitive damages allowable pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294.

\\

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows;

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

1. Those damages provided for in California Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.61;
2. For costs of suit herein incurred;
3. Prejudgment interest; and
4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

SECOND THROUGH EIGHTH CAUSES OF ACTION

1. For special and general damages as allowed by law;
2. For Punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294;
3. Prejudgment interest;
4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and
5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. For Damages provided for in California Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.34;
2. Punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code Section 3294;
3. Prejudgment interest;
4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

\\

\\

1 5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

2 Dated: January 24, 2014

3 **THE DOLAN LAW FIRM**

4 By: 

5 Christopher B. Dolan Esq.
6 Attorney for Plaintiffs ANG JIAN LIU,
7 HUAN HUA KUANG, ANTHONY LIU
8 and the of ESTATE OF SOPHIA LIU

9 **Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury.**

10 Dated: January 24, 2014

11 By: 

12 Christopher B. Dolan, Esq.
13 Attorney for Plaintiffs ANG JIAN LIU,
14 HUAN HUA KUANG, ANTHONY LIU
15 and the of ESTATE OF SOPHIA LIU
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CM-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Christopher B. Dolan, Esq. (SBN 165358) The Dolan Law Firm 1438 Market Street. San Francisco, CA 94102 TELEPHONE NO.: (415) 421-2800 FAX NO.: (415) 421-2830 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs		FOR COURT USE ONLY <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; letter-spacing: 0.5em;">FILED</div> Superior Court of California County of San Francisco JAN 27 2014 CLERK OF THE COURT BY: <u><i>Elis R</i></u> Deputy Clerk	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Francisco STREET ADDRESS: 400 McAllister Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Francisco, 94102 BRANCH NAME: Unlimited Civil Division		CASE NUMBER:	
CASE NAME: Ang Jiang Liu, et al v. Uber Technologies, Inc., Raiser LLC, Raiser-CA LLC, Syed Muzzafar, and Does 1-30		JUDGE: CGC - 14 - 536979 PER:	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		Complex Case Designation <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:

Auto Tort <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Auto (22) <input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04) <input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24) <input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45) <input type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practice (07) <input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08) <input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13) <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16) <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25) <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36) <input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)	Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06) <input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18) <input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37) Real Property <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33) <input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26) Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31) <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38) Judicial Review <input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11) <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02) <input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) <input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10) <input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27) <input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Miscellaneous Civil Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21) <input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)
---	--	---

2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of separately represented parties | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of witnesses |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve | e. <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial amount of documentary evidence | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision |
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. ☒ monetary b. ☐ nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ☐ punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): **9**
5. This case ☐ is ☒ is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date:

Christopher B. Dolan, Esq. (SBN 165358)

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

Christopher B. Dolan
 (SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET**CM-010**

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check **one** box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the **primary** cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES**Auto Tort**

- Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death
- Uninsured Motorist (46) (*if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto*)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

- Asbestos (04)
 - Asbestos Property Damage
 - Asbestos Personal Injury/Wrongful Death
- Product Liability (*not asbestos or toxic/environmental*) (24)
- Medical Malpractice (45)
 - Medical Malpractice—Physicians & Surgeons
 - Other Professional Health Care Malpractice
- Other PI/PD/WD (23)
 - Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)
 - Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism)
 - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
 - Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

Other PI/PD/WD**Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort**

- Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)
 - Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (*not civil harassment*) (08)
 - Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)
 - Fraud (16)
 - Intellectual Property (19)
 - Professional Negligence (25)
 - Legal Malpractice
 - Other Professional Malpractice (*not medical or legal*)
 - Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)
- Employment**
- Wrongful Termination (36)
 - Other Employment (15)

Contract

- Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)
 - Breach of Rental/Lease
 - Contract (*not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction*)
 - Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller
 - Plaintiff (*not fraud or negligence*)
- Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty
- Other Breach of Contract/Warranty
- Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)
 - Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff
- Other Promissory Note/Collections Case
- Insurance Coverage (*not provisionally complex*) (18)
 - Auto Subrogation
 - Other Coverage
- Other Contract (37)
 - Contractual Fraud
 - Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

- Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)
- Wrongful Eviction (33)
- Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
 - Writ of Possession of Real Property
 - Mortgage Foreclosure
 - Quiet Title
- Other Real Property (*not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure*)

Unlawful Detainer

- Commercial (31)
- Residential (32)
- Drugs (38) (*if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential*)

Judicial Review

- Asset Forfeiture (05)
- Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
- Writ of Mandate (02)
 - Writ—Administrative Mandamus
 - Writ—Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter
- Writ—Other Limited Court Case Review
- Other Judicial Review (39)
 - Review of Health Officer Order
 - Notice of Appeal—Labor Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)

- Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
- Construction Defect (10)
- Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
- Securities Litigation (28)
- Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)
- Insurance Coverage Claims (*arising from provisionally complex case type listed above*) (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

- Enforcement of Judgment (20)
 - Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)
 - Confession of Judgment (*non-domestic relations*)
 - Sister State Judgment
 - Administrative Agency Award (*not unpaid taxes*)
 - Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
- Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

- RICO (27)
- Other Complaint (*not specified above*) (42)
 - Declaratory Relief Only
 - Injunctive Relief Only (*non-harassment*)
- Mechanics Lien
- Other Commercial Complaint Case (*non-tort/non-complex*)
- Other Civil Complaint (*non-tort/non-complex*)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

- Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)
- Other Petition (*not specified above*) (43)
 - Civil Harassment
 - Workplace Violence
 - Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse
 - Election Contest
 - Petition for Name Change
 - Petition for Relief from Late Claim
- Other Civil Petition